III. REMARKS

1. Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 22 remain in the application. Claims 19-21 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

2. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-13 and 15-18 are definite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In claims 1 and 12 as amended, the term "candidate group" has been defined as a group of characters where each successive character is correspondingly related to one of the at least one keys that is pressed successively.

3. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-13, 15-18, and 22 are patentable over the combination of Grover et al. (US 5,818,437 "Grover") in view of Yu et al. (US 5,852,414 "Yu").

The combination of Grover and Yu fails to disclose or suggest a processor operable to automatically perform a second comparison of a second candidate group of characters to the set of stored words if and only if the first comparison is unsuccessful, where the second character group includes a second character of the predetermined characters related to the pressed key, as recited in claims 1 and 12.

The combination of Grover and Yu fails to disclose or suggest performing a first, second and third comparison of a suggested character, and automatically accepting the suggested character as a recognized character on the basis of the recognition of the pressed key, the pressure distribution of the pressed key, and the first, second, and third comparisons, as recited in claim 22.

Applicants find no disclosure in Grover or Yu related to automatically performing a second comparison if and only if the first comparison is unsuccessful as recited in claims 1 and 12.

The present Office Action states:

> Grover et al. teaches a keyboard arrangement (Fig. 1) including several keys (202) for inputting characters by pressing the keys (See Fig. 1, 202), the keyboard arrangement comprising: a processor (604) operable to perform a first comparison of the first candidate group of characters to a storage of words of a defined language and to accept one of the characters of the first candidate group of characters as a desired character if the first comparison is successful, wherein the processor is further operable to automatically perform a second comparison of a second candidate group of characters candidate to the set of stored words if the first comparison is unsuccessful, where the second character group includes a second character of the predetermined characters related to the pressed key (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no description of a second comparison in Grover or Yu.

In column 4, line 46 through column 5, line 25, Grover describes several ways that keystrokes may be interpreted and in each case candidate words 207, 210 are displayed in a list menu according to a rank. Grover interprets keystrokes and displays candidate words. However, Grover does not automatically perform a second comparison if the first comparison was unsuccessful. There is no disclosure in Grover related to determining if a first comparison was unsuccessful or not, and nothing related to a second comparison.

Yu discloses how correct characters are selected by using separate electrical contacts in each key for each alternative character. There is nothing in Yu related to a processor

operable to automatically perform a second comparison of a second candidate group of characters to the set of stored words if and only if the first comparison is unsuccessful

In the Response To Arguments section of the present Final Office Action dated 17 May 2004, the Examiner states:

> With respect to applicant's argument about "the reference does not teach a comparison of a character to words", it does.

This quote: "the reference does not teach a comparison of a character to words" is not found in the previous response filed on 20 January 2004, and misses the point of Applicants' arguments. Applicants maintain that neither Grover nor Yu have any description related to automatically performing a second comparison as described by the present invention.

In addition, Applicants find no disclosure in the combination of Grover and Yu related to performing a first, second and third comparison of a suggested character, and automatically accepting the suggested character as a recognized character on the basis of the recognition of the pressed key, the pressure distribution of the pressed key, and the first, second, and third comparisons, as recited in claim 22.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, and 22, and dependent claims 2-11, 13, and 15-18, are patentable over the combination of Grover and Yu.

4. Applicants note that there is no 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection of claim 22. Nevertheless, the features of claim 22 are described in the specification on page 5, line 20 through page 6, line 7, and shown in Figure 7, such that any

person skilled in the art can make and use the invention without undue experimentation.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph V. Gamberdell, Jr. — Date: 19 July 2004
Reg. No. 44,695

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450.

Date: 19 July 2004 Signature: _____
Person Making Deposit